



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/816,877	04/05/2004	Steven E. Strauss	STRAUSS 13	2669

EXAMINER	
PARRIES, DRU M	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2836	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
09/12/2007	PAPER

7590 09/12/2007
MANELLI DENISON & SELTER PLLC
7th Floor
2000 M Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20036-3307

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/816,877

Applicant(s)

STRAUSS, STEVEN E.

Examiner

Dru M. Parries

Art Unit

2836

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 May 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 25 June 2007 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings were received on June 25, 2007. These drawings are acceptable.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed May 22, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Regarding the argument that there is no integrated circuit power rail in the prior art references, the Admitted Art (the main reference) teaches an integrated circuit (550) having an integrated circuit power rail (400) (Fig. 5).

Regarding the Brodeur reference not teaching an integrated circuit, the fact that the Admitted Art (the main reference) IS an integrated circuit and the modifications are being done to the Admitted Art reference, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the Admitted Art reference with the teachings of other references in the form of an integrated circuit. Meaning if one is to modify the Admitted Art reference with teachings of a plurality of voltage regulators and voltage meters, it would be obvious to add the voltage regulators and meters in integrated circuit form to the Admitted Art reference, so that the modification wouldn't destroy the main reference, and because it just makes sense. Also, the fact that Brodeur doesn't teach a power rail is moot, since the Admitted Art teaches one.

Brodeur teaches a transformer (32, 33; which is equivalent to Admitted Art's first voltage regulator (500)) and a plurality of voltage regulators (35-38), which supply an output to corresponding loads (equivalent to 402-404 in Admitted Art). He also teaches a plurality of voltage meters (nodes closest to V_{out} , which are connected to negative input of comparators, 38) to measure the voltage being output to a plurality of sections of the

Art Unit: 2836

circuit. Brodeur's voltage meters *measures the voltage* at the output and compares it to a reference voltage (via 38). The Applicant is correct in saying that the SWITCH is NOT a VOLTAGE METER, and the Examiner is not saying that either.

Lastly, the Admitted Art is the main reference, and the only modifications done to it are adding voltage regulators and meters (in integrated form, of course) on each branch between the power rail (400) and sections (402-404) and modify the method of operation and the inner workings of the first integrated voltage regulator (500). With the modifications as set out above, the combination of these two references read on the claimed invention.

3. Applicant's arguments, see page 6, filed May 22, 2007, with respect to claim 11 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The objection of claim 11 has been withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Prior Art (Admission) and Brodeur (6,525,434). Admission teaches an integrated circuit with a power management architecture including power rails supplying power to a plurality of sections (three sections, each including one of 402, 403, 404). Admission teaches a first integrated voltage regulator (500) to supply power to said power rail. (Fig. 5) He fails to teach a plurality of voltage regulators and voltage meters, the inner workings of the first

Art Unit: 2836

integrated voltage regulator, and a control system. Brodeur teaches the inner workings of a first voltage regulator (31-34, 42), he teaches a plurality of voltage regulators (35-38) and voltage meters (nodes closest to V_{out} , connected to 38), each being associated with a different section (with a different V_{out}), and all sections have a voltage meter. He also teaches the output of the first voltage regulator being controlled based on a voltage levels of said plurality of sections (info received from 41). Brodeur also teaches the output voltage of each of the plurality of voltage regulators being controlled (via processor 35, 38) based on the voltage level measured at each voltage meter to be able to supply the correct power to each load that is being powered by each section. (Fig. 2) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the inner workings of Brodeur's first voltage regulator in Admission's first integrated voltage regulator since Admission was silent on this issue and Brodeur teaches a version that is known in the art. It also would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement the plurality of voltage regulators and voltage meters, and the control system of Brodeur's system, associated with each section of the system, into each section of Admission's invention so that each section of the system could have the precise output voltage necessary for each section and in turn would add more versatility to the system to be able to power a more diverse grouping of loads. Also, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement Brodeur's elements (voltage regulators, meters, etc.), into the Admitted Art's invention, in integrated circuit form, so that Admitted Art's invention can still function properly.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dru M. Parries whose telephone number is (571) 272-8542. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday -Thursday from 9:00am to 6:00pm. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Sherry, can be reached on 571-272-2800 x 36. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published

Art Unit: 2836

applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

DMP

8-22-2007

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'M. Sherry', with a large, stylized 'M' and a cursive 'Sherry'.

**MICHAEL SHERRY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**